

MEMO TO: City Council

FROM: Rosemarie Ives, Mayor

DATE: July 19, 2005

SUBJECT: **ORDINANCE: ADOPT THE INNOVATIVE HOUSING
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM AS A LIMITED DURATION
AMENDMENT TO THE REDMOND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT GUIDE**

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program Ordinance as a limited duration amendment to the Redmond Community Development Guide.

II. DEPARTMENT CONTACT PERSONS

Roberta Lewandowski, Director of Planning and Community Development, 425-556-2447
Rob Odle, Policy Planning Manager, 425-556-2417
Terry Shirk, Senior Planner, 425-556-2480

III. DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND

During the early stages of the major update to the Comprehensive Plan, the City embarked on a number of public outreach programs to solicit input from the community on the future needs for Redmond. Consistently, the public remarked that more variety and choice in housing sizes and styles was important to meet the changing needs of Redmond's population. Based on this input, Council directed that the primary objectives for the Comprehensive Plan update were to 1) increase the supply and diversity of housing and 2) manage traffic associated with growth.

Following the Housing Fair and Redmond Design Day held respectively in May and June 2002, the City was approached by a local developer and an architect who had developed an innovative housing concept that they felt fit the community interests discussed at the two public events. A presentation was made to the City Council on their "Tetrad" concept: a fourplex designed to look like a single-family home on a traditional lot that fit within the footprint of the existing structure with less lot coverage than that shown on the prototype lot.

Subsequently, City Council did adopt policies in the Comprehensive Plan update that would allow consideration of this and other forms of innovative housing within the community.

Specifically, Policy HO-31 states:

HO-31 Endorse a pilot program for consideration of innovative housing in Redmond that helps promote City goals for affordability, high-quality design and housing to meet a diversity of household sizes, types, and age ranges. Allow flexibility in density and design standards to promote the pilot program.

The proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Program seeks to implement Policy HO-31 by allowing submittal of a limited number of applications for innovative forms of housing in R-4 through R-8 zones. The program, which has a limited duration of three years, allows up to two times the underlying density for projects that include a diversity of home sizes, styles, and affordability levels, up to a maximum of twelve units per development. Flexible design and development standards are established for projects that qualify as an innovative proposal, provided the homes are designed to look like single family homes.

A review panel appointed by the Mayor and consisting of members of the City's Technical Committee, Design Review Board, Planning Commission and any active Citizen Advisory Committees members will consider the innovative housing criteria and information provided through community meetings in determining whether proposals should be allowed to proceed with development review applications. A limit of five innovative developments per year, with no more than two in any one neighborhood, is included in the Ordinance. For exceptional projects, the City Council may allow additional developments and density in excess of these limitations.

The proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Program should be adopted because it:

- Specifically implements Comprehensive Plan policies to allow for an innovative housing demonstration program and encourage variety in housing choices.
- Will help identify what other forms of housing can be provided within single family neighborhoods without significantly affecting the character or function of those neighborhoods.
- Will be a tool for identifying what regulatory barriers exist to providing different forms of housing in Redmond.
- Creates opportunities to disperse affordable housing throughout the community.

Complete details about the proposal and the Planning Commission's recommendation for approval of the ordinance are provided in the Planning Commission's Report that was included in the City Council packet for the July 12, 2005 Study Session.

IV. IMPACT

- A. **Service Delivery:** Adoption of the proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Program effectively implements several policies of the recently updated Comprehensive Plan. These include increasing the supply and diversity of home sizes and styles so that people of all ages and households sizes will have more housing choices in Redmond, dispersing affordable housing throughout the community, providing more opportunities to live closer to where they may work, and promoting a variety of home choices that preserve the character of single-family neighborhoods in Redmond. The program also encourages broad public involvement in the process, through display of proposals at City Hall and neighborhood meetings to inform residents of the proposals and seek their input.
- B. **Fiscal:** In order to provide incentives for the development of innovative housing, the Planning Commission has supported flexibility in the assessment of planning fees, impact fees and utility hook-up fees, allowing the lesser of fees to be applied between multi-family and single-family developments. For water hook-up fees, the Planning Commission supported a program that will allow fees to be determined based on fixture number instead of per unit. Although the actual fiscal impact is not known, it is likely to be minimal because of the limited number of developments that are allowed through this Ordinance.

V. ALTERNATIVES

- A. **By ordinance adopt the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program as an amendment to the Community Development Guide.** Adoption of the ordinance as recommended by the Planning Commission will enable the City to meet its goals for improving the supply and diversity of housing choices, allow for dispersal of affordable housing options throughout the City, and help identify regulatory barriers to allowing various forms of housing that fit within existing single-family neighborhoods. The plan will also help the City achieve many of its overall goals within the Comprehensive Plan for housing choices and affordability and allowing for consideration of innovative housing.
- B. **Direct the Planning Commission to make additional changes or modifications to the proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Program.** The proposed ordinance to allow the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program responds to community requests for more diversity in home sizes and styles. The ordinance was prepared by including public participation at a public hearing and several study sessions and also intensive evaluation by the Planning Commission. If changes are directed by the City Council, implementation of the program will be delayed, and opportunities to provide some forms of innovative housing may be missed.

- C. Deny the request to adopt the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program.**
If the ordinance is not adopted, the City will not meet one of its adopted Comprehensive Plan policies to allow a demonstration pilot program for innovative housing as described in Comprehensive Plan Housing Element Policy HO-31. The City will lose opportunities to identify regulatory barriers to providing more diversity in housing choices within single-family neighborhoods, and there will be fewer opportunities to disperse affordable housing options throughout the City. Variety in the types of housing choices including cottages and multiplex housing could still be built, but with more inflexible requirements and timelines than what would be allowed under the plan.

VI. TIME CONSTRAINTS

There are no specific time constraints for implementing the proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Program. However, current interest rates and land values are increasing, and opportunities to develop some forms of innovative housing may be missed, if delayed.

VII. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A:** Ordinance adopting the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program as an Interim Amendment to the Redmond Community Development Guide.
- Attachment B:** Attached by reference are all other related materials that were provided to the City Council in their July 12, 2005 packet.

/s/ _____
Roberta Lewandowski, Planning Director

7/8/05

Date

Approved for Council Agenda: /s/ _____
Rosemarie M. Ives, Mayor

7/8/05

Date

ATTACHMENT A

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REDMOND,
WASHINGTON RELATING TO AN INTERIM
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GUIDE
AMENDMENT TO ALLOW FOR INNOVATIVE
HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AND
ESTABLISHING A SELECTION PROCESS FOR
SUCH PROJECTS.**

WHEREAS, the City has the authority to adopt an interim zoning Ordinance pursuant to RCW 35A.63.220 and 36.70A.390; and

WHEREAS, the City of Redmond is interested in promoting a diverse mix of housing types and sizes to provide for citizens of all ages and all income levels; and

WHEREAS, standard zoning practices may limit the ability of developers and builders to provide the type of diverse housing that is compatible within existing single-family neighborhoods in the City of Redmond; and,

WHEREAS, the Redmond City Council has determined that there is a need for an interim zoning Ordinance to regulate innovative housing demonstration projects and to determine whether changes are needed to the development regulations to allow for different forms of housing; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to RCW 35A.63.220 and 36.70A.390, a public hearing on the interim zoning Ordinance herein established was held prior to the adoption of this Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Redmond ordains as follows:

Section 1. The Redmond City Council makes the following findings:

a. The purpose of this interim zoning Ordinance is to allow development of a limited number of projects to evaluate opportunities to increase the availability of innovative housing in Redmond's single-family neighborhoods.

b. The innovative housing styles that will be allowed in all R-4 through R-8 zones under this Ordinance include but are not limited to cottages, compact single-family homes, and duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes designed to look like single-family homes. Accessory dwelling units (ADU's) that are incorporated as part of the innovative housing are also encouraged. The city will consider other housing styles that meet the intent of this Ordinance.

c. The goals of innovative housing demonstration projects are to:

- i. Increase housing supply and the choice of housing styles available in the community
- ii. Promote housing affordability and greater choice by encouraging smaller and more diverse home sizes and mixes of income levels.
- iii. Promote high quality design
- iv. Allow flexibility in site and design standards while promoting projects that are compatible with existing single-family developments.
- v. Help identify a work plan and any zoning code amendments that are necessary to support the development of innovative housing choices within single-family neighborhoods in Redmond.

d. Until permanent ordinances regarding innovative housing projects can be implemented, there is a need to allow a limited number of regulated innovative housing projects.

Section 2. Development Guide Amendment

a. A zoning change applicable to all properties in the R-4 through R-8 zones is hereby established to allow the development standards contained in this Ordinance to apply for eligible Innovative Housing Demonstration projects.

b. The change to the R-4 through R-8 zones shall be applicable only to those developments that comply with the provisions of the Innovative Housing Demonstration Ordinance, and which have been authorized to proceed pursuant to this Ordinance.

c. Developments not considered under the provisions of this Ordinance are subject to the development standards contained in RCDG 20C.30 and all other applicable sections of the Redmond Community Development Guide.

Section 3. Submittal of Innovative Housing Demonstration Project

a. Timing. Within ninety (90) days after the effective date of this Ordinance, the City shall begin accepting applications for Innovative Housing Demonstration Project proposals.

b. Number of developments. Except as described below, the City may approve up to five innovative housing demonstration projects, with no more than two projects demonstrating the same single housing type within any calendar year

or within any single neighborhood, unless additional projects are allowed by the City Council as follows.

- i. The City Council may authorize the submittal of proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Project proposals in addition to those described in Section 3b of this Ordinance, provided such proposed projects demonstrate exceptional design quality and exceptional consistency with the requirements and parameters of this Ordinance.
 - ii. Proposals not authorized for submittal by the City Council may be resubmitted for consideration at the beginning of the next calendar year as long as this Ordinance remains in effect.
 - iii. For purposes of this Ordinance, the first calendar year shall begin on the effective date of the Ordinance, and then on January 1 thereafter.
- c. Materials. Applications for an Innovative Housing Demonstration Project shall be made on forms provided by the City and shall include the following materials:
- i. A site plan of the proposed development, indicating property lines, proposed setbacks, and lot coverage calculations. The site plan shall also include the location of all adjacent structures and distance to property lines, and the footprint of any existing structures on the property.

- ii. Conceptual drawings of the proposed innovative housing type including building footprints and building elevations, floor plans, and roof plans.
- iii. A description of how the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood character and neighborhood design standards.
- iv. A description of how the proposed development complies with all the criteria and project parameters for an innovative housing demonstration project as described in this Ordinance.
- v. A description of the proposed unit type, including proposed square footage, unit mix, and number of bedrooms per unit.
- vi. General information about the site including the number of dwelling units allowed by the zone and the number of proposed dwelling units, open space allowed and proposed, impervious surface allowed and proposed, building height allowed and proposed.
- vii. Photographs of the subject and adjacent properties keyed to the site plan.
- viii. Additional information as required by the application forms provided by the City or deemed necessary by the Review Panel to consider the application.

ix. A conceptual site plan, including building foot print(s), demonstrating the type of development that would likely occur if the site were developed under the City's traditional zoning and design standards for the site.

d. Applications submitted under this Ordinance shall be available for public review for a minimum of two weeks prior to the neighborhood meeting described in Section 4.

Section 4: Neighborhood Meeting Required

a. Developers of innovative housing projects submitted under this Ordinance shall schedule and host a neighborhood meeting following the guidelines established by the Planning Department and including attendance by City staff. The neighborhood meeting shall be held within two to eight (2-8) weeks following submittal.

b. Notice of the neighborhood meeting shall be mailed to all property owners within 500' of the proposed project with details of the proposed project including a description of any modification or flexibility in site design standards that have been requested. The City shall also make every effort to include parties who have expressed an interest in the innovative housing program and shall work with the media to inform the community about the proposed developments.

c. Following the neighborhood meeting, the applicant shall consider public input received during the neighborhood meeting and consider recommendations, if any, for revising the proposed innovative housing project to respond to neighborhood concerns. Any revisions to the proposal shall be provided to the City within ninety (90) days of the neighborhood meeting.

Section 5. Authorization to Proceed

a. Within six (6) weeks of submittal of any revisions to the proposal that are made as a result of the neighborhood meeting, a Review Panel as described below shall decide which proposals will be authorized to submit development review applications pursuant to Section 6 of this Ordinance. The Review Panel shall consider recommendations of staff, with input from the Technical Committee to determine which applications submitted under this Ordinance will be authorized to proceed to the next level of review. The review panel shall consider applications based on the responses to the criteria for consideration contained in this Ordinance. The review panel shall consist of the following representatives to be appointed by the Mayor:

- i. One member of the Redmond Planning Commission
- ii. Two members of the Redmond Design Review Board
- iii. One member of the Redmond Technical Committee
- iv. One member of any active Citizen Advisory Committee or neighborhood association for the neighborhood in which the project is located.
- vi. In instances where there is no active CAC or neighborhood association, the Mayor shall appoint a second member of the Planning Commission to serve on the review panel.

b. In addition to the requirements contained in this Ordinance, the Review Panel shall use the following criteria in determining which applications will be authorized to proceed to the next level of review:

- i. Consistency with the intent of the innovative housing goals of providing a variety of housing choices (specifically demonstrating, but not limited to, those housing styles identified in this Ordinance), compatibility with surrounding single-family development, and improving housing affordability options.

c. Following authorization from the Review Panel to proceed, the applicant shall submit to the City an application for a Site Plan Entitlement to be considered under the City of Redmond Type II Permit Process, unless another permit process is required

d. Decisions of the Review Panel in selecting proposals that are authorized to proceed as innovative housing demonstration projects may be appealed to the City Council.

Section 6. Permit Process

a. Within six (6) months following authorization from the Review Panel to proceed, the applicant shall submit the appropriate development review applications as described below. The applicant may request, in writing, a maximum extension of six (6) months provided it is demonstrated to the City's reasonable satisfaction that progress has been made in preparing the submittal.

- i. Except for Innovative Housing Demonstration Projects that involve a subdivision as defined by the City of Redmond Community Development Guide, the City shall use a Type II Review process as described in Section 20F.30.35 of the

Redmond Community Development Guide to review and decide on innovative housing demonstration projects, with the additional requirements as described in Section 6(c) of this Ordinance.

- ii. For Innovative Housing Demonstration Projects that involve a subdivision as defined by Section 20A.20.190 of the Redmond Community Development Guide, the City shall use a Type III Review process as described in Section 20F.30.40 of the Redmond Community Development Guide to review and decide on Innovative Housing Demonstration Projects, with the additional requirements as described in Section 6(c) of this Ordinance.

b. In addition to complying with the approval criteria stated for a Type II or a Type III review process, the applicant must demonstrate that:

- i. Except as otherwise provided in this Ordinance, the proposal is compatible with surrounding development with respect to building heights, roof forms, property lines, parking location and screening, access, and lot coverage.
- ii. The proposal provides elements that contribute to a sense of community within the development by including elements such as but not limited to front entry porches, common open space, and common buildings or common spaces within buildings.

c. The applicant may propose additional modifications to the development standards requirements of the Redmond Community Development Guide upon demonstration that such modifications are important to the success of the proposal as an innovative housing project and are necessary to meet the intent of this Ordinance. The City shall prioritize review of any RCDG Code modifications that are deemed appropriate to allow for prompt consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.

d. In order to meet the goals of the innovative housing demonstration program, there will be flexibility with regard to some normally applicable regulations and requirements. Standards listed in this Paragraph as well as parameters identified in Section 7 of this Ordinance will apply to innovative housing demonstration projects and will prevail if they conflict with existing regulations. Unless otherwise specified in Section 7 of this Ordinance, all other regulations and requirements of the City of Redmond will continue to apply, except that applicants may propose additional modifications to the Redmond Community Development Guide, as provided for in Section 6(d) of this Ordinance.

- i. The minimum lot size, restriction of not more than one dwelling unit per lot, and minimum number of required parking spaces found in the Redmond Community Development Guide shall be replaced by the standards identified in Section 7 of this Ordinance.
- ii. Planning application fees for the review of the proposed project shall be based on the number of single-family units

that would be allowed by the underlying zone, regardless of the number of units being built under this Ordinance.

iii. Impact fees under the Redmond Community Development Guide shall be determined based on the impacts associated with the proposed development, and may be adjusted administratively upon demonstration that the impacts will be the same or less than those associated with a traditional development.

iv. Stormwater fees and utility hook-up fees shall be determined based on the actual anticipated usage or on a per unit basis, whichever is less.

e. The City's approval of an innovative housing project does not constitute approval of a subdivision, a short plat, site plan entitlement, or a binding site plan, nor does it exempt the project from proceeding under the review requirements for a Type II or Type III Development Review process, whichever applies or from obtaining all necessary permits required under the International Building Code.

f. The City of Redmond reserves the right to deny an application for development under this Ordinance without prejudice.

Section 7. This table sets forth parameters applicable to innovative housing project applications.

Parameters	
Housing Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any attached or detached single-family housing type, as defined by the Redmond Community Development Guide. Ownership housing is preferred, but projects that include a component of rental housing, such as Accessory Dwelling Units as part of the single-family development, are also encouraged.
Design Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Except as specified below, regardless of the neighborhood in which the proposed development is located, the City's design standards for residential design for the Grass Lawn neighborhood as described in Ordinance 2249 shall apply, while allowing flexibility when necessary to meet the intent of this Ordinance. Projects located in the Willows/Rose Hill, Grass Lawn, or Downtown neighborhoods, or within other neighborhoods that adopt neighborhood residential design standards after the effective date of this Ordinance, shall comply with applicable design standards for those neighborhoods. Any innovative housing development proposals located in the Willows/Rose Hill neighborhood shall not preclude construction of the innovative housing development detailed in the Willows/Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan.
Setbacks and Lot Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects which meet the setbacks from adjacent properties for the zone in which the development is located are preferred. However, modifications to the setbacks and lot coverage may be considered if it is demonstrated that said modifications are required for construction of the proposed housing type. Any modification to the setbacks and lot coverage shall minimize adverse impacts on adjoining properties.
Unit Size Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There shall be no minimum size requirements for the individual units, provided units meet the minimum livability standards as defined by the Building Code. For projects that include "size limited" housing units, a covenant restricting any increases in unit size after initial construction may be recorded against the property. Projects that include a mix of unit sizes within a single development are preferred, including homes that provide ground floor master suites or similar configurations with all living areas on one level
Locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City-wide in all R-4 through R-8 residential zoning districts. Projects which propose more than 2X the underlying density should be located on or near an arterial or close to transit.

Parameters	
Number of Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to five, with no more than two projects demonstrating the same single housing type within any calendar year and within any one neighborhood. ▪ The City Council may authorize additional projects of any single housing type when demonstrated to be compatible with existing single-family neighborhoods.
Public Notice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neighborhood meeting, including City staff attendance, required prior to submittal of application for Type II or Type III permit review. ▪ Normal publishing and posting after application received. ▪ Mailing of notice to adjacent residents and property owners within 500 feet of the proposed development after application received.
Access Requirements and Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The applicant shall work directly with the Public Works and Fire Departments to determine general flexibility for utility standards, road widths, public vs. private, and turn-around requirements. ▪ The applicant shall verify with the Public Works department that adequate water, sewer, and stormwater capacity exists to service the proposed development.
Development Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A maximum of 12 units shall be permitted as part of any innovative housing demonstration project.
Ownership Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision ▪ Condominium ▪ Single owner for entire project (to allow rental)
Community Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shall be clearly incidental in use and size to the primary residential units. ▪ Shall be commonly owned by the residents of the development, unless otherwise approved by the Technical Committee.
Accessory Dwelling Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May be considered as part of any submittal.
ADA Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Developments which include a portion of the units that are fully accessible under the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, exclusive of such requirements under the Building Code, are strongly encouraged.
Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Except as provided below, developers are strongly encouraged to include housing units that provide for a broad mix of income levels, including a portion of the units that are affordable to households earning 80% or less of the King County Median Income. ▪ Projects located in the Willows/Rose Hill, Grass Lawn, and Downtown Neighborhoods, or senior housing developments anywhere within the City shall comply with existing affordable housing requirements.

Parameters	
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unless otherwise approved, the following minimum parking standards shall apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 stall per unit for units under 700 square feet in size • 1.5 stalls per unit for units 700 to 1,000 square feet in size • 2 stalls per unit for units over 1,000 square feet in size ▪ Shall be provided on the subject property. ▪ Should be screened from public streets and adjacent residential uses by landscaping or architectural screening. ▪ Shall be located in clusters of not more than 6 adjoining spaces. ▪ Shall not be located in the front yard setback, except on a corner lot where it shall not be located in the front yard between the entrance to any cottage and the front property line. ▪ May be located between or adjacent to structures if it is located toward the rear of the structure and is served by an alley or driveway. ▪ All parking structures shall have a pitched roof design with a minimum slope of 4:12.
Trip Generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Review Panel may consider the number of vehicle trips that will be generated by a proposed innovative housing demonstration project in determining its appropriateness for the location.
Sensitive Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All proposed innovative housing demonstration projects shall meet the criteria of the City's Critical Areas Ordinance.

Section 8. If any provision of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.

Section 9. This Ordinance shall be in force and effect thirty days from and after its passage by the Redmond City Council and publication, as required by law, and shall expire three (3) years following its adoption unless extended by the City Council.

ROSEMARIE IVES, MAYOR

Attest/Authenticated:

Malisa Files, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY:

By: _____
James E. Haney

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK:
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL:
SIGNED BY THE MAYOR:
PUBLISHED:
EFFECTIVE DATE:
ORDINANCE NO. _____

O:\COUNCIL\Agenda Packets\2005\SS\Jul 12 2005\PC Recommended Innovative Housing Ordinance.doc

ATTACHMENT B

Planning Commission Report

To: City Council

From: Planning Commission

Staff Contacts: Roberta Lewandowski, Director of Planning and Community Development (425) 556-2447
Rob Odle, Policy Planning Manager (425) 556-2417
Terry Shirk, Senior Planner (425) 556-2480

Date: June 8, 2005

DGA Number:

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

Recommended Action: Adopt Ordinance No. _____, implementing the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program for a period of three years in order to evaluate how different forms of housing can be designed to fit within single-family residential neighborhoods.

Summary: Comprehensive Plan Housing Policy HO-31 promotes the implementation of a pilot housing program to evaluate how different forms of housing can be provided within single-family neighborhoods. This is also consistent with other policies of the Comprehensive Plan to promote a diversity of home sizes and styles throughout the City so that people can remain in their neighborhoods throughout changes in household size and age.

The program, which has a limited duration of three years, allows up to two times the underlying density for projects that include a diversity of home sizes, styles, and affordability levels, up to a maximum of twelve units per development. Flexible design and development standards are established for projects that qualify as an innovative proposal, provided the homes are designed to look like single family homes.

It is anticipated that the program will help identify what other forms of housing can be provided within single family neighborhoods without significantly affecting the character or function of those neighborhoods. The Ordinance will also be a tool to identify what barriers exist and what Code changes are needed to allow different forms of housing within Redmond.

A variety of housing forms are encouraged through this program. These include, but are not limited to, multi-plex housing, Accessory Dwelling Units, cottages, and size limited structures. The Ordinance, which in effect results in a zone change for all single family zones in the City, allows flexibility in lot sizes, setbacks, and lot coverage. It also waives limitations on the number of homes allowed per lot.

Following a public display of proposals at City Hall, qualifying projects will be required to hold a neighborhood meeting with attendance by City staff. A Review Panel, appointed by the Mayor and comprised of members of the Planning Commission, Design Review Board, Technical Committee and any active Citizen Advisory Committee or neighborhood association, will evaluate which proposals meet the criteria and authorize those projects to proceed with submittal of development applications and the development review process. A maximum of five proposals and no more than two in any given neighborhood would be allowed per year, unless the City Council authorizes consideration of exceptional projects.

Background: When the City first embarked on the recent update to the Comprehensive Plan, a series of public outreach events were hosted by the City. These included the Redmond Housing Fair and Redmond Design Day, along with many small group meetings within each neighborhood. Consistently, residents reported that the City lacks a diversity of housing choices and affordability levels. Building on the momentum of these events, two residents of the Education Hill neighborhood approached staff and then the City Council with a proposal to allow a four-plex on an existing single family lot in Education Hill. The proposed design presented a single-family appearance, created a mix of smaller home sizes that would be relatively affordable, and fit within the footprint of the existing structure with less lot coverage than the existing home. After viewing the proposal, the City Council directed staff to implement a program that would allow consideration of this and similar projects through a demonstration program.

The proposed Ordinance is associated with several policies contained in the recent updates to the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element. These policies encourage programs to identify innovative forms of housing that may be appropriate in Redmond's single-family neighborhoods, but which may not be currently allowed because of development standards. Specifically, Policy HO-31 states:

HO-31 Endorse a pilot program for consideration of innovative housing in Redmond that helps promote City goals for affordability, high-quality design and housing to meet a diversity of household sizes, types, and age ranges. Allow for flexibility in density and design standards to promote the pilot program.

The attached Ordinance seeks to implement Policy HO-31 by allowing submittal of a limited number of applications for innovative forms of housing in R-4 through R-8 zones. Upon adoption, the Ordinance will be effective for three years, but may be extended by the City Council. As proposed, applications submitted under this Ordinance will be subject to selection by a Review Panel and will be required to hold a neighborhood meeting prior to application submittal.

Key components of the proposed Ordinance include:

- Flexibility in design standards to help promote variety and choices in housing sizes and affordability.
- Waiver of density limitations and restrictions on the number of homes allowed per lot provided the project demonstrates high quality design and is compatible in style with the surrounding neighborhood.
- Design standards to promote compatibility of innovative housing with existing single-family neighborhoods.
- Identification of any regulatory amendments that may be appropriate to allow various forms of housing that are currently restricted by development standards.
- Several opportunities for public review, comment, and participation in the selection process.

Because the intent of this Ordinance is to encourage innovative housing styles, projects authorized to proceed to application submittal by the Review Panel will be considered under the Type II review process, unless a subdivision is required which would prompt a Type III review process.

**Reasons the
Proposal should
be Adopted:**

The proposed Innovative Housing Demonstration Ordinance should be adopted because it:

- Helps implement Comprehensive Plan policies to encourage variety in housing choices and to provide additional opportunities for people to live closer to work.
- Specifically implements Housing Policy HO-31 to allow an Innovative Housing Demonstration Project.
- Will serve as a useful tool in identifying regulatory barriers and solutions to promoting variety in housing choices, particularly in single-family neighborhoods.
- Provides a mix of housing sizes and styles within a single development, providing housing needs for households of varying ages and sizes.
- Creates opportunities to disperse affordable housing throughout the community.

- Includes regulations and design standards that will protect the character of single-family neighborhoods while allowing higher density infill housing.
- Promotes flexibility to allow the development community to be creative in providing solutions to Redmond's housing needs.
- Encourages public participation in the program.

Public Participation

1. Public Hearing and Notice

a. Public Hearing Date

The City of Redmond Planning Commission held one public hearing regarding the proposed policies on February 16, 2005. Approximately 3-4 people attended this hearing. The public was given additional opportunities to comment on the proposed ordinance at Planning Commission Study Sessions held on February 9, April 27, May 11, and May 18. Public comments focused on the proposed review and selection processes and generally supported the proposed Ordinance.

b. Notice

Notice of the public hearing was published in the Eastside edition of the Seattle Times on February 2, 2005. Public notices were posted in City Hall and at the Redmond Library, and also on the City's website and cable television. Notice was also given by including the hearing date in Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas mailed to various members of the public and various agencies. Notice was also provided to those who had previously indicated an interest in the subject.

2. Public Comments

The Planning Commission heard comments on the proposed Ordinance from several parties during the public hearing and under items from the audience at subsequent study sessions. One citizen provided written correspondence seeking clarification on the neighborhood meeting process.

A total of three people spoke during the duration of the Planning Commission's review of this Ordinance. All of the people who spoke were in favor of the proposed program. One of the speakers testified about his experiences working with the City of Kirkland on a similar innovative pilot program, and provided suggestions regarding the selection and review process for consideration by the City of Redmond. He also recommended a limit on the number of units that could be built through this proposal and suggested that bonus density be linked to the size of the units, as Kirkland had done. Another speaker testified regarding the establishment of deadlines for submittals of innovative proposals, citing concerns that deadlines may result in proposals that were not as well thought out than they might have been given no deadline restrictions. Public testimony was also provided against a Technical Committee recommendation that the number of units allowed be linked to a vehicle trip generation factor, citing that the limitations on the number

of units that would be built under the Ordinance would not result in a significant increase in the number of vehicle trips and that the requirement would be difficult to enforce and could stifle creativity. Lastly, all three of the speakers emphasized the importance of enforcing flexibility in the City's review of innovative developments, particularly with respect to utility requirements.

The Planning Commission responded to most of the comments made by the public by making changes to the staff recommendations, while preserving the intent of the proposed program.

A summary of the Planning Commission's major discussion issues can be found in Attachment B, which includes a more detailed description of public comments. Attachment C includes a copy of the public hearing minutes and written comments submitted to the City.

Planning Commission Consideration

1. *Key Issues Raised by the Planning Commission*

In addition to issues raised by the public, the Planning Commission raised several issues of its own. Attachment B includes a summary of the Planning Commission's major discussion issues and responses. Below are the key issues raised by the Planning Commission.

a. Review and selection process for proposed Innovative Housing Developments: Deadlines, public involvement, Review Panel consideration.

The Planning Commission considered a number of alternatives for implementing the review and selection process for proposed Innovative Housing developments. Included within this topic were the issues of deadlines for submittals, public involvement in the review process, sequencing requirements for neighborhood meetings, and the number of reviews by the Review Panel. Summaries of the Planning Commission discussion on these items can be found in the Issues Matrix in Attachment B under Nos. 1, 2, 6, and 16.

Deadline for Submittals. Public testimony regarding the establishment of deadlines for the submittal of proposals varied, with one speaker encouraging a deadline to allow for broad advertisement of the program and notice to neighbors that a proposal had been received. Another speaker felt that a deadline might result in proposals that were rushed through the design process in order to meet the deadline and expressed concern that limiting submittals to twice a year could adversely impact development feasibility. In response, the Planning Commission considered annual, twice yearly, and quarterly submittal deadlines. Many felt that establishing a date certain for applications would motivate developers to submit

proposals, allow comparison and review of different developments within the context of variety and dispersal, and encourage more competition among applicants. However, there was also concern that annual or semi-annual deadlines might discourage some proposals because of the length of time between deadlines. Ultimately, the Commission supported allowing proposals to be submitted on a year round basis, but felt it important to create a broad public advertisement of the program for the initial submittals with a deadline for the first round.

Public Involvement. The Commission wanted to ensure that any notices sent regarding proposed innovative housing developments clearly specify the development standards for which the developer is seeking flexibility so that neighbors understand why their participation might be important to them. The Ordinance provides that notice will be sent to all neighbors within 500 feet of a proposed development at the time the application is received. The notice will describe the proposed development (including any specific standards for which the developer is seeking relief), proposed neighborhood meeting dates (to be hosted by the developer with staff in attendance), and indicating that proposals are on display to the public at City Hall.

Review Panel Consideration. The Ordinance establishes a Review Panel that will be charged with determining which projects are authorized to proceed to the submittal of development review applications (likely a Site Plan Entitlement or Short Plat). The Review Panel will consist of one member of the Planning Commission, two members of the Design Review Board, one member of the Technical Committee, and one member from any active Citizen Advisory Committee or neighborhood association for the neighborhood in which the project is located. If there is no active CAC or neighborhood association, the Mayor shall appoint a second member from the Planning Commission to serve on the Review Panel.

The Planning Commission considered a number of alternatives for how the Review Panel will be involved in the process. In order to allow timely review of proposals, the Commission agreed that it would be best to hold the neighborhood meeting early in the process, with the Panel's review occurring after the public input. This will also give applicants the opportunity to make any changes to their proposal in response to public input before the Review Panel considers the proposal.

The Review Panel, with recommendation from Planning staff, will determine which proposals best meet the intent of the Innovative Ordinance in authorizing projects to submit development review applications (such as a Site Plan Entitlement or Short Plat). Once development review applications are submitted, the proposal would be required to meet all other requirements of the City's development review process, with allowed flexibility in design and development standards pursuant to the provisions of the Innovative Housing program.

b. Number of allowed units, unit sizes, density, and location.

Summaries of the Planning Commission discussion on these items can be found in the Issues Matrix in Attachment B under Nos. 3, 9, 11, and 12.

Staff originally proposed that innovative developments contain a minimum of four units and a maximum of twenty-four. The Planning Commission received testimony suggesting that proposals should contain no more than 12 units per development because of community dynamics, and that fewer than four units per development would be difficult to accomplish. The speaker also noted that, in implementing Kirkland's innovative ordinance, the City linked the allowed density in innovative developments to the size of the units: smaller units were entitled to higher density than larger units.

Number of allowed units. In response to public testimony, the Planning Commission recognized that there may be some instances in which fewer than four units in an innovative development could be achieved and removed the restriction on the minimum number of units. However, the Planning Commission also felt that projects containing more than 12 units within any single development might adversely impact a neighborhood and ultimately reduced the maximum number of allowed units to twelve. Rather than link density to the unit size as Kirkland had done, the Planning Commission supported staff's recommendation to require variety in the sizes and styles as part of an innovative development.

Location. The Technical Committee, in supporting the proposed Ordinance, proposed that density be limited to a maximum of 2 times the underlying density, unless the project is located on or near an arterial street. The Ordinance also allows higher density for exceptional projects that meet the criteria of the Ordinance. The Technical Committee felt that this restriction would help reduce impacts on surrounding development that could result from higher density. Conversely, the Planning Commission felt that their changes reducing the maximum number of units within an innovative development to twelve, in itself, would reduce impacts within any neighborhood and therefore softened language to encourage, but not require homes with more than twice the underlying density to be located on or near an arterial.

Density. The Planning Commission considered changing the allowed density to 4 times the underlying zone, but was split with a 3-3 vote. Those dissenting felt that the Ordinance provides sufficient flexibility to allow the City Council to authorize higher density for exceptional projects.

c. Restrictions on the number of vehicle trips generated as a tool for reducing impacts.

The Technical Committee recommended that the number of units allowed per innovative development be restricted based on the number of vehicle trips generated by the project, such that the innovative development would not result in more trips than what have otherwise been permissible on a typical development. Citing a number of issues, one of the speakers expressed concern over this approach. Specifically, he felt that innovative developments can mitigate for a number of site constraints such as lot coverage, runoff, and infrastructure requirements, but that the innovative developments will not match 100% the impacts from a standard single-family development. He felt that there had to be flexibility in the standards and acceptance of some additional impacts in order to make the program successful and allow for good design. These comments were supported by another speaker who added that there is not enough data to fully quantify the number of trips that are generated by smaller single-family homes, and that it would be difficult to compare developments. The Planning Commission concurred with the speakers, and supported removing this restriction based on the limit of twelve units per innovative development. The Commission did however add language that allows the Review Panel to consider trip generation factors in determining the appropriateness of the project for its location. The full discussion is found in Issue No. 5 on the Issues Matrix in Attachment B.

d. Impact fees

In response to public comments, the Planning Commission discussed how a variety of City fees would be calculated for innovative developments. In particular, the Commission suggested that multi-family rates apply for impact fees and inquired about stormwater fees and utility hook up fees. Public comments supported the Commission's proposal to assess the lesser of any fees be applied to provide incentives and promote construction of the demonstration projects. The Ordinance also allows the City to adjust impact fees based on the impacts associated with the proposed development, upon demonstration that the impacts will be the same or less than those associated with a traditional development.

In response to public comments, the Planning Commission also considered the City's approach to assessing hook up fees. Currently, the City charges hook up fees on a per unit basis, regardless of the size of the unit. This is a disincentive for providing smaller units. The Commission supported an approach that allows stormwater fees and utility hook-up fees to be based on the lesser of a per fixture charge or per unit charge.

The Commission's full discussion on this issue can be found under Issue No. 17 in Attachment B.

2. Planning Commission Recommendation

The motion to recommend adoption of the Innovative Housing Demonstration Program Ordinance was approved by a vote of 6 to 0, with one Commissioner absent. The Planning Commission's Report was reviewed by Planning Commissioners and approved at their June 8, 2005 meeting.

List of Attachments

- Attachment A:** Ordinance No. _____, adopting an interim Community Development Guide amendment to allow for innovative housing demonstration projects.
- Attachment B:** Planning Commission's Issues Matrix
- Attachment C:** Planning Commission Hearing Minutes
- Attachment D:** Public Comments

Roberta Lewandowski, Planning Director

Date

Martin Snodgrass, Planning Commission Chairperson

Date

Approved for Council Agenda: _____
Rosemarie Ives, Mayor

Date

ATTACHMENT C

PLANNING COMMISSION ISSUES MATRIX INNOVATIVE HOUSING ORDINANCE MAY 18, 2005

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
1.	Review Panel Representation	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> The Planning Commission expressed concern that, as currently proposed, the review panel may have an even number of representatives. The Commission suggested adding additional an representative who would be appointed by the Mayor when there is no active neighborhood association or Citizen Advisory Committee to provide for a fifth representative on the panel.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff agrees.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> None.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission agreed that in instances when there is no active CAC or neighborhood association, that a second member of the Planning Commission should be appointed by the Mayor to result in a five member review panel. Thus, the review panel would consist of two members of the Planning Commission, two members of the Design Review Board, and one member of the City's Technical Committee.</p>	Closed
2.	Expedited Review, Permitting, and Approval Process for Innovative developments. a. Deadlines for submittal of Innovative proposals b. Number of meetings for the Review Panel consideration	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Commissioner Querry asked about any opportunities to expedite development review for innovative housing developments.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff is supportive of establishing a deadline for submittal of applications, provided there is some mechanism to allow for review and consideration of exceptional projects outside of the deadline limitations.</p> <p>The Technical Committee, in making its recommendation to the Planning Commission felt that a second meeting of the review panel to ensure that any appropriate changes in response to neighborhood input were adequately addressed by the applicant before</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES	DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
<p>c. Expedited permit review with outside consultants</p>	<p>granting authorization to proceed to submittal of development applications. It is possible that the Technical Committee could be responsible for ensuring these changes were made as part of review of the development applications.</p> <p>The City currently allows developers to seek outside consultant review for plan check review for building code specifications and compliance. With the recent adoption of the International Building Code, developers can pay for their own consultant to review and certify compliance with building code requirements, and submit stamped plans as part of the building permit application. This is similar to how engineering documents are reviewed. If the applicant does not have their own consultant, one could be hired by the city (and paid for by the applicant), but because the City does not have an ongoing contract with any consultants for this type of review, it would take some time for the City to retain these services.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p>A speaker at the Public Hearing reported on Kirkland's process for review of innovative housing demonstration projects and noted that Kirkland set a specific date for submittal, had a limited duration for the ordinance (which was extended an additional 6 months), involved the public in the early review process of proposed developments, and allowed for outside consultant review of building permits.</p> <p>Another citizen provided written comments seeking clarification about the neighborhood meeting process.</p> <p>At a later study session, a speaker expressed concern that any timeline restrictions for submittal may result in substandard proposals because there would not be sufficient time to develop a cohesive proposal, and that by allowing submittals throughout the year for exceptional projects, developers would be better prepared to propose projects that closely meet the intent of the Ordinance. The speaker was however supportive of broadly promoting and advertising the first round of submittals, and then allowing submittals throughout the following year.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p> <p>The Planning Commission discussed a number of alternatives for submittal of innovative proposals ranging from allowing year round submittals to establishing twice yearly deadlines for submittal of proposals. Many felt that establishing a date certain for applications would motivate developers to submit proposals, allow comparison and</p>	

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p>review of different developments within the context of variety and dispersal, and encourage more competition among applicants. Discussion ensued about allowing submittals two, three, or four times per year with some expressing concern that twice per year may discourage some proposals because of the length of time between submittal deadlines. At one point,, the Commission agreed to establish a twice yearly submittal date, but allow the City Council to authorize exceptional proposals to proceed outside the deadline limitations. However, this position was changed based on public comments at the final study session. Ultimately, the Commission supported allowing submittal on a year-round basis, but felt it important to create a broad public advertisement of the program for the initial submittals with a deadline for the first round. Because of the limit of only 5 innovative projects per year, the Commission recommended that the timeline for the yearly restriction begin on January 1 of each year.</p> <p>The Planning Commission also considered a number of alternative review processes for the selection of innovative proposals. Alternatives including various sequencing requirements for the neighborhood meetings and the number of reviews by the Review Panel were considered. Ultimately, the Commission agreed on the process that requires the neighborhood meeting to be held early in the process, with Review Panel involvement in the meeting. The Commission felt that this alternative provided good balance between ensuring good neighborhood input in the process and timely review of proposals.</p>	
3.	<p>Unit size and number of units allowed per innovative development</p> <p>a. Minimum number of units per innovative development.</p> <p>b. Maximum size of each unit.</p> <p>c. Maximum number of units in any cluster.</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Commissioner Parnell hypothesized a situation in which adjoining property owners propose an innovative development containing less than 4 developments. This could include two units on each parcel, or a combination of the two lots to allow for three homes.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff supports the removal of the restriction for the minimum number of units in an innovative development. Additional language has been added to the Ordinance that encourages a variety of home sizes, including smaller units, within each innovative development (see February 16 packet). With respect to limiting the number of homes in any particular cluster, staff intentionally drafted this language to allow for creativity</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p>within the design concepts. The Review Panel will have the opportunity to consider community aspects of the proposal as part of its review. Additionally, to prevent the use of this Ordinance to be used as a wholesale rezone of larger parcels, the Ordinance as originally proposed limited the number of innovative units within any proposal to 24 homes.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> A speaker at the Pubic Hearing stated that fewer than four units would be difficult to accomplish, and that the City should consider restricting the number of units within a cluster to 12 because of community dynamics. He also suggested that the City's bonus for the units should be linked to the size of the units, and should not allow double density for simply proposing an innovative development. He noted that the innovative development he is building in Kirkland contains a mix of home sizes starting at 700 square feet for a one bedroom, single level home. This has been the most popular model, and they will be forced to sell it through a lottery process.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission recognized that there may be an innovative housing opportunity that would contain fewer than four units, and eliminated the restriction on the minimum number of units within any development. However, there was additional concern that projects containing more than 12 units within any single development might adversely impact a neighborhood, and the Commission ultimately reduced the maximum number of units to twelve.</p>	
4.	<p>Evaluation of impacts from similar developments.</p> <p>Query</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Commissioner Query asked for information about the impacts (such as trip generation, infrastructure) on the surrounding residents that were represented in the study session presentation.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff contacted planners in Bellevue and transportation staff in Redmond to inquire about any adverse impacts resulting from the sample developments shown in the presentation. Bellevue reports that the example of the fourplex development has not resulted in any complaints within the neighborhood, nor has the duplex development at Saratoga. Redmond transportation staff has had a lot of communication with residents of Woodbridge where the example of the triplex was taken; however traffic</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p>impacts associated with the triplex units has never been raised as an issue with neighboring homeowners. The fiveplex development (Malden Court) is in an area that is surrounded by a mix of single family homes. When staff toured that development and spoke with neighbors, no complaints about the development were expressed.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> There were no public comments.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> There was no additional Planning Commission discussion. There was discussion related to trip generation factors in No. 5 below.</p>	
5.	<p>Enforcement of Trip Generation restrictions.</p> <p>Several</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Several Commissioners inquired about any mechanisms the City has to enforce trip generation restrictions.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Except for major developments, the City typically relies on trip generation factors that are determined at the time of permit issuance to be the only source for limiting the number of vehicle trips that result from any particular development project. For some major projects, the City has required the developer to post a bond for future improvements and to hire a third party to monitor the actual number of trips generated. If it is determined through monitoring that the impacts are greater than what was projected, then the bond is utilized to make the needed improvements.</p> <p>Staff feels that, given the scale of projects likely to be developed under this Ordinance, a requirement to post a bond for monitoring of the trip generation factors would be too onerous for the developer to provide innovative housing.</p> <p>Draft language was provided to the Planning Commission that that would trigger the requirement for restricting the number of trips generated only for those developments that proposed more than 2X the underlying density.</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p>A speaker during audience comments at the study session expressed concern over the trip generation limitations. He stated that an innovative project can mitigate for lot coverage, address run off from the development and provide for infrastructure demands, but that he can't make innovative housing match 100 percent with existing regulations and have it work. Something has to give somewhere. Traffic is one impact that developers can't resolve. Trip generation limitations could work on larger developments, but not well on the smaller infill developments. The City is behind on its housing targets, and if there was a way to fix it easily, it would have been done. He noted that there are not many eligible lots on which an innovative development would occur and that it is not worth trying to lock down the number of trips because the impact will be minimal from the few developments. During the public hearing, he added that the Ordinance should not preclude good design by recognizing that there will be some, although minimal impacts from allowing the additional density.</p> <p>A second speaker during the public hearing concurred that there is no good data available to describe the number of trips generated for detached 1-2 bedroom homes. He said that it is likely to be similar to the number of trips generated by multi-family homes with 1-2 bedrooms which is significantly fewer than the trip factors for traditional single family development.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p> <p>The Planning Commission felt that by reducing the maximum number of units within a proposed innovative housing development from 24 to a maximum of 12, there would not be enough impact to require a restriction on the number of trips generated. However, the Commission added language allowing the Review Panel to consider the number of trips generated by any proposed project in determining its appropriateness for the location.</p>	
6.	<p>Public Involvement</p> <p>a. Radius for notification of neighborhood meeting.</p> <p>b. Public participation in the Panel Review process</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u></p> <p>Commissioner Petitpas asked if the Commission should consider expanding the radius for the number of homes that are notified of the neighborhood meeting for an innovative development.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>Several years ago, the City updated its regulations to make the notification procedures for all development applications consistent within the City. It was agreed at that time that 500' should be the standard notification area. For several development</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES	DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
	<p>applications, this resulted in an increase in the notification area from 300 feet. If the radius was changed for the neighborhood notification process for innovative housing developments, it would be a different standard than every other development application in the City and will be more difficult to administer. Staff does not recommend this change.</p> <p>However, in addition to the 500' mailing that would occur for the neighborhood meeting, there are a number of other mechanisms the City uses to keep the public informed about pending development review applications. This includes regular updates to the City's website, articles in the Focus Magazine, and communication with local newspapers. In addition, we now have active Citizen Advisory Committees for both the North Redmond and Education Hill neighborhoods, and recent contact with both the Grass Lawn and Willows/Rose Hill neighborhoods. Each of these forums will be used to keep the public informed about any innovative housing proposals within the City.</p> <p>Although the level of details would not typically be specified within the Ordinance, it has been intended by staff that the general public would have early notification and involvement in the Panel's review of submitted proposals. Notification of submittals would occur through press releases, articles in Focus Magazine, updated information and pictures on the website, and via RCTV Channel 21. The suggestion of placing proposals on public display at City Hall will provide additional opportunities for review and comment by the public. Staff will take the following actions for notifying the public about innovative proposals:</p> <p>Upon receipt of an application for an innovative housing development, notice will be sent to all property owners within 500' of the subject property notifying them of the proposal. The notice will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly explain the proposal, including any proposed design flexibility standards that would be applied. • Invite residents to view the proposal(s) on the website, RCTV Channel 21, and/or at City Hall. • State the date and location for review by the Review Panel • State the date and location that the applicant will host a neighborhood meeting. 	

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p><u>Public Comments</u> A speaker at the public hearing reported that Kirkland made a broad public announcement about their innovative housing pilot program and made all the proposals available for viewing at City Hall for approximately 3 weeks prior to the review panel consideration.</p> <p>Written comments provided to the Planning Commission request evaluation of the Type III and Type IV review process and notice requirements.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission prompted modifications to the notice process to make it clear to surrounding property owners why their involvement in the review process might be important to them.</p>	
7.	How will the City promote this program to developers and homeowners?	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Several Commissioners asked how developers and individual homeowners will become informed about this process? Commissioner Parnel asked about promoting the program to the BuiltGreen industry.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> There are a number of tools available for informing the public and the development community about this process. As noted above, the City utilizes the web, local newspapers, and Focus Magazine to keep citizens informed about Redmond activities. In addition, staff has contacted a number of local developers who have expressed an interest in providing different forms of housing. There is also a local trade journal in which we plan to advertise. Lastly, staff has been attending the pre-application conferences for developments located in the Education Hill and North Redmond neighborhoods to inform developers and land owners about the proposed regulations.</p> <p>It should be noted that a number of developers, including those who are interested in low impact, or “green” building techniques, have been tracking this program and have contacted staff requesting information about the proposed Ordinance. Staff has also sent information directly to developers we know to be interested in innovative construction and have invited them to participate in the process.</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<u>Public Comments</u> There were no public comments. <u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission discussed this issue as part of their consideration of the review process described in Issue No. 3.	
8.	Duration for ordinance effectiveness.	<u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> The Commission considered an alternative to the draft Ordinance that would allow pilot program to be ongoing. <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff is supportive of allowing the program to continue as needed to allow for consideration of various forms of housing. The Technical Committee recommended a shorter duration to allow the pilot to run on a trial basis. <u>Public Comments</u> A speaker at the study session commented that allowing the program to be ongoing would allow the City greater control and input over innovative housing development proposals and supported an amendment to allow the program to continue. <u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission opted to enable the innovative pilot program to be an ongoing program, with a duration of three years for the acceptance of innovative housing proposals.	Closed
9.	Promoting variety of home choices within each innovative development. Several	<u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> The Planning Commission noted that there is no requirement for variety of home choices within an innovative development and requested an amendment that would require variety in the sizes (and styles) of units. <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff is supportive of this amendment and will provide alternative language. <u>Public Comments</u> None. <u>PC Discussion</u> Changes accepted as proposed by staff.	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
10.	Applicability of Design Standards a. Portray a single family character from the street. b. Height of structures c. Parking d. Community Building	<u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Several Commissioners asked about implementation of the recently adopted Grass Lawn design standards for innovative developments. In particular, the question was raised if the demonstration project presented at the study session would comply, or if there are other standards that could also provide sufficient direction in the design of innovative developments. <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff's cursory evaluation of the "Tetrad" proposal indicates that the development would be consistent with the Grass Lawn design standards. It is important to note that the City must have specific guidelines under which developments will be considered with respect to design. <u>Public Comments</u> One speaker at the public hearing commented that during the permit review process, it will be important for public works to be somewhat flexible in their review. For example, in reviewing utility requirements it may be more appropriate to apply standards more comparable to multi-family developments than to traditional single family subdivision utility standards. <u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission agreed that additional flexibility should be built in to the Ordinance provided developments remain consistent with the intent of the Ordinance (such as retaining single family character and variety in home sizes). In general, developments proposed under this Ordinance will be required to follow the design standards that were recently adopted for the Grass Lawn neighborhood.	Closed
11.	Location Restrictions for more than 2X density	<u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> The Technical Committee felt that proposed innovative developments with density of more than 2 times what is allowed on the subject property would have fewer impacts if they were located on an arterial and close to transit. The language as proposed allows for some flexibility in the location. However, in general "on or near" would be defined to be within 1-2 blocks of an arterial. Generally, a project is considered to be close to transit if it is within ¼ mile of a transit route.	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p>If the Planning Commission agrees that allowing more than 2X the density is stretching the intent of the program, the Planning Commission could also consider allowing more than 2X the density in exchange for demonstrating affordability of the housing. This could be either that some of the units meet some explicit affordability requirement (for example, 80% of median income), or that all the units achieve some relative level of affordability applied across the development (for example, all the units are affordable to 100% median income homes). Another point of emphasis in allowing more than 2X the underlying density could be creating units of varying sizes.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> A speaker at the study session requested clarification of how “on or near” an arterial would be defined. He also noted that due to the lack of available land, there will not be many properties that are eligible for an innovative development and will therefore not have a significant impact on traffic.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission softened the language to encourage, but not require homes that propose more than 2X the underlying density to be located on or near arterials.</p>	
12.	<p>Restriction of 2X the density</p> <p>a. Linking density to the type or size of the proposed unit</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u></p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> The Technical Committee felt that restricting developments to no more than 2X the underlying density would help reduce impacts on surrounding development that could result from higher density.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> See public comments discussion in Item No. 3.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission considered changing the allowed density to 4X the underlying zone, but was split by a 3-3 vote. Those dissenting the change felt that the Ordinance provides sufficient flexibility to allow the City Council to authorize higher density for exceptional projects.</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
13.	Up to five and no more than 2 restriction.	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u></p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff recommended that no more than five innovative developments occur in any given year under the ordinance so that the City would have sufficient opportunity to evaluate proposals and determine their appropriateness within neighborhoods. The restriction of no more than two of any one type of housing was suggested for similar reasons; this will allow greater flexibility for the City to restrict housing types if it is determined that the innovative style is not compatible with existing housing in the neighborhoods. The City Council will have the ability to allow additional developments if they are deemed appropriate.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> A speaker commented that the City should not allow unlimited development of innovative developments, but that the Ordinance can be crafted to allow review on individual basis of exceptional, well designed, or strongly compatible developments.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> One Commissioner proposed limiting the proximity of proposed developments within a one year time frame. There was no support for this change from the rest of the Planning Commission.</p>	Closed
14.	Affordability	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u></p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> The intent of the Ordinance is to provide opportunities for review of other forms of housing than what has been commonly provided in Redmond and to identify any additional regulatory changes that are needed to provide for variety and affordability in housing choices. The language could be strengthened so that developers of innovative housing are expressly challenged to design innovative homes that meet the intent of the Ordinance, provide (relative) affordability, and feature high quality design.</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<u>Public Comments</u> A speaker during the study session expressed concern that land and development costs would make it difficult for developers of fewer than 10 homes to be able to provide affordable housing, but that the cost of smaller homes in smaller developments could be relatively less expensive than standard single-family homes. <u>PC Discussion</u> There was no additional discussion by the Planning Commission.	
15.	Exceptions for impervious surface improvements. a. Incentives for “BuiltGreen” developments	<u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Consider allowing more density if projects include pervious surfaces <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> <u>Public Comments</u> None <u>PC Discussion</u> None.	Closed
16.	Selection Process	<u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> The Commission requested additional discussion on the selection process for innovative housing developments. <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff provided a number of alternatives for consideration by the Planning Commission. The alternatives included a mix of sequencing for the neighborhood meetings and timing for the Review Panel consideration. <u>Public Comments</u> None. <u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission opted for the alternative that provided adequate balance between involving the neighborhoods in the review process and ensuring timely review of innovative housing proposals.	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS												
17.	<p>Developer/homeowner Incentives</p> <p>a. Fee structure</p> <p>b. City-paid utilities</p> <p>c. WIFI within the development</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> In response to public comments, the Planning Commission raised concerns about how fees would be calculated for innovative developments. In particular, the Commission suggested that multi-family rates apply for impact fees, and inquired about stormwater fees and utility hook-up fees.</p> <p>Commissioner Parnell suggested that an incentive for developers and future homeowners could be that the City would pay the utilities for irrigation of common areas within an innovative development. He also suggested that WIFI wiring be required.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Impact fees for mutli-family and single family developments are assessed as follows per unit:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Single Family</td><td>Mutli-Family</td></tr><tr><td>Fire</td><td>\$94.00</td><td>\$133.00</td></tr><tr><td>Parks</td><td>\$1,611</td><td>\$1,400</td></tr><tr><td>Transportation*</td><td>\$763.95-\$2,833.54</td><td>\$468.96-\$1,739.40</td></tr></table> <p>* Transportation Impact Fees are calculated based on the project location within the City. Figures shown above reflect the ranges within each transportation zone</p> <p>Stormwater fees are based on the amount of impervious surface. Additional information will be provided at the meeting.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> Two speakers addressed this item, supporting that the lesser of any fees be applied to provide incentives and promote construction of the demonstration projects. It was also noted that utility hook up fees are generally assessed by unit, with no adjustments for smaller units, One speaker suggested that the City waive impact fees for proposed innovative developments.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> After consideration, the Planning Commission agreed that the language as written addressed concerns over impact fees. The Ordinance allows the impact fees to be assessed based on the impacts associated with the proposed development and allows the fees to be adjusted administratively upon demonstration that the impacts will be the same or les than those associated with a traditional development.</p>		Single Family	Mutli-Family	Fire	\$94.00	\$133.00	Parks	\$1,611	\$1,400	Transportation*	\$763.95-\$2,833.54	\$468.96-\$1,739.40	Closed
	Single Family	Mutli-Family													
Fire	\$94.00	\$133.00													
Parks	\$1,611	\$1,400													
Transportation*	\$763.95-\$2,833.54	\$468.96-\$1,739.40													

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p>With regards to stormwater and utility fees, the Planning Commission felt that some allowance should be made to encourage small unit construction and supported language that allows the stormwater fees and utility hook-up fees to be based on the lesser of a per fixture charge or per unit charge.</p> <p>There was no support by the Commission for requiring City paid utilities or for installation of WIFI equipment in the innovative units.</p>	
18.	<p>Guidelines vs. Parameters for the decision criteria.</p> <p>Parnell</p>	<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u> Commissioner Parnell proposed a change to the introductory language in Section 7 of the Ordinance to read:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“This section sets forth some parameters for determining whether a proposal is consistent with the intent of this ordinance.”</p> <p>Commissioner Parnell indicated that the intent of this proposed change is to allow the Review Panel the ability to consider additional criteria and interpret the Commission’s intent since it is difficult to predict what will happen in the future with regards to innovative building techniques, materials, site usage, needs, & etc. Thus the addition of the word “some”.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> Staff feels that there may be some instances in which flexibility in the regulations may be appropriate, but that developers will also rely on having clear criteria to follow in submitting their proposals. Staff suggests the following language be added to Section 7 to address Commissioner Parnell’s concerns:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“In addition to the requirements contained in this Ordinance, the Review Panel and the City shall use the following criteria in evaluating proposed innovative housing developments and allowing flexibility with these standards when permitted by this Ordinance provided the proposed project meets the intent of this Ordinance.”</p> <p>Another approach might be to add another row in the “Parameters” table that allows broader flexibility with the requirements for exceptional projects. Currently, there is flexibility built into the review of proposed projects with respect to several issues. For</p>	Closed

SUMMARY OF ISSUES		DISCUSSION NOTES	STATUS
		<p>example, there is flexibility in considering the number of units allowed, setbacks and lot coverage, and affordability. If another row is added to specify additional flexibility by the Review Panel or the City, the Commission may want to reconsider those areas where flexibility is already provided through the Ordinance.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> One speaker at the final study session expressed concern that too much regulation in the Ordinance would stifle the creativity it was seeking to gain.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Planning Commission considered the changes proposed by Commissioner Parnell and the staff alternative. Several of the Commissioners agreed that because the Ordinance has enough “safety nets” and is of a short duration that no changes were needed to the Section 7 introduction. In addition, the majority of the Commission felt it more important to retain some control over the types of projects allowed by this Ordinance to adequately determine the outcomes. There was no other support for the proposed change.</p>	
		<p><u>Preliminary PC Direction</u></p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p>	

O:\TERRYS\HOUSING\Innovative Ordinance\Council Review\PC Innovative Housing Issues Matrix.doc

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 16, 2005

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Allen, Dunn, McCarthy, Parnell, Petitpas, Querry

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Marpert, Terry Shirk, Lori Peckol, Redmond Planning Department; Arthur Sullivan, A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH)

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chair Snodgrass in the Public Safety Building Council Chambers.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. February 9, 2005

The meeting summary was approved by acclamation.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE – None

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION

Proposed RCDG Amendment
– Innovative Housing Pilot Program

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing open.

Mr. Jim Soules, president of The Cottage Company and developer of Redmond's first cottage project, said his company is also developing housing in Kirkland under their new innovative housing code. He suggested that Redmond should consider having two submittal dates each year, rather than focusing on the first five that come in. That is the approach taken by Kirkland; they also made a decision within 30 days. Redmond should be clearer with regard to the "beauty contest" submittal; it should call for conceptual designs, renderings and site plans. That is especially important in those instances where a developer does not own the property. Shoreline was the first city to adopt a code allowing cottage housing. Their code, however, was not prescriptive enough, and only the first of the three projects developed to date was deemed satisfactory, and steps are being taken to revise the code. Among other things, they are considering a larger minimum lot size to allow for sufficient wiggle room to be creative. The proposal for

Redmond to allow staff to have flexibility with regard to design control should work well. Consideration should be given to establishing minimum size projects; developments with fewer than four units are difficult to accomplish, and the amount of administrative management needed is about the same as for projects with eight or twelve units. All bonuses should be tied to something related to the size of the units similar to the approach used in Kirkland. There is an incredible demand in the market for different types of housing.

Continuing, Mr. Soules said Shoreline determined its bonus based on the underlying zoning, which was six units per acre. However, Shoreline has a minimum lot size of 7200 square feet, which does not permit six units per acre. The bonus does not work. Kirkland requires applicants as part of the “beauty contest” to show how a property could be developed under the conventional zoning. Their density bonus is based on the number of units that can be achieved under the conventional zoning, not on some arbitrary number of units per acre.

Scale will be the key to success. The results have not been good in all cases where someone has tried to build big houses on small lots. The character of the developments as viewed from the public street should be single family. Trip generation is an issue that must be addressed. Absent an actual study, the best that traffic engineers can do is base trip generation for cottage developments on townhouse developments, which is usually about 80 percent of what is generated by single family. With regard to utilities, he was generally concerned that utilities and public works regulations designed for single-family homes do not related well to this type of development.

Commissioner Parnell asked if Redmond could benefit from soliciting ideas from both out of state and out of country developers. Mr. Soules said development tends to be regional in nature. The built-green community should at the very least be given notice of the pilot program.

Commissioner Parnell asked if a size limit should be established. Mr. Soules pointed out that Redmond already has a size limit in the cottage code. He said he could see tougher height restrictions considered for cottages. Until the mid 70s the average home was 1500 square feet; for some reason the market thinks 2500 square feet should be the norm. There is a very big market for small homes.

The cottage project in Redmond has 12 units on a fairly small site, with impervious surfaces taking up half the land area of a standard subdivision. The homeowners are having to pay double what an average single family home pays because no credit is being allowed for the open space that resulted from clustering the homes. Efforts are under way to convince the city to make a change, especially where the size of the units is regulated.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Dunn, Mr. Soules said his preference would be to develop a project with a variety of housing sizes. What happened with the cottage project was all the buyers were one- and two-person households; there were no

families with children. In many ways the pilot program is far more attractive than the cottage development was. With respect to community dynamics and interaction of the residents, he added that for projects with 12 or more units there is a tendency among some to withdraw and assume others in the association will run things. Accordingly, 12-unit projects are ideal, 24 if done in two clusters of 12 each.

Mr. Soules stressed the importance of including community buildings in clustered projects.

Commissioner Dunn asked what underlying zoning will work best for the project mix, and Mr. Soules said R-4 through R-8 works very well. He added that the two times bonus density is too generous for 1500 to 1900 square foot homes; fifty percent is more than enough.

Commissioner Petitpas asked if there are problems associated with the impact fees. Mr. Soules said when the cottage project was developed, the full price of impact fees was paid for each unit as if they were 12 single family homes. Kirkland levies its impact fees for cottage developments at the multifamily development rates.

Mr. Curt Bateman, 13315 175th Avenue NE, voiced his support for analyzing the sewer and water hookups and allowing credits for smaller units. He said if the five projects per year equate to approved projects, there will be no need for a “beauty contest”. He encouraged the Commission not to go down that road and to leave the issue wide open.

Chair Snodgrass said his reading of the ordinance is that there would be five projects total, not five per year. Senior Planner Terry Shirk said the intent is to approve up to five per year, which is not to say that the city will not accept more than five.

With regard to enforcement of trip generation restrictions, Mr. Bateman suggested that it is not necessarily enforceable. He added that it is much ado about nothing given that similar projects in the area have not historically generated any complaints. Staff should be allowed flexibility in reviewing the design; there should not be an arbitrary restriction imposed.

Mr. Pedro Castro, 10515 171st Avenue NE, said he is the architect working with Mr. Bateman and his team. He encouraged the Commission to consider incentives for getting things approved in a timely manner. There is a huge demand for housing, and timely approvals can keep projects on schedule and moving forward.

Commissioner McCarthy asked what amount of time can be considered timely in getting a project approved. Mr. Castro suggested that the city should be able to issue a building permit in four weeks or less instead of six weeks or more. The review of projects involves many different city departments, and some mechanism should be found to allow each to work parallel to the others.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Parnell, Mr. Castrol allowed that no rule fits every situation. However, in Redmond the process to get a permit to reface a building is the same process that must be followed to construct the entire building in the first place. There must be some way to streamline that. The innovation will have to flow from the city staff. The development community needs both a timely turnaround and a predictable process.

Mr. Soules said one of the interesting things about constructing the Kirkland project was that once The Cottage Company had been chosen staff sat down with the company to work out all the problems. When it came time to submit the Type II application, all the ducks were lined up and approval was issued in 90 days. Kirkland issues building permits within ten days when there is a third party review, which the developers must pay for; their normal process requires up to four months for a home permit.

With no additional persons wishing to address the Commission, Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing closed. He allowed that written materials would still be accepted.

With regard to the issue of the “beauty contest”, there was consensus to put the item on the issues list for further discussion.

It was agreed that because unit size limits are already in place, the matter does not need to be discussed further.

There was consensus to add to the issues list the matter of relating the density bonus to the size of the property and how the bonus should be calculated.

Chair Snodgrass proposed that the single family character issue is adequately covered by the reference to the design standards. The other Commissioners concurred.

There was agreement to add the topic of trip generation to the issues list, as well as treating the developments as multifamily when it comes to sewer and water connections, and offering a mix of unit sizes within each development.

The issue of whether or not to market the project outside the local region was added to the list for additional discussion, as was the concept of including a community building in such projects.

Commissioner Parnell proposed discussing further encouraging broadband, wi-fi and other services not currently offered in the neighborhood.

There was agreement to add to the issues list the minimum and maximum number of units in a cluster. There was also concurrence to discuss further how to assure timely project review and approval decisions.

Commissioner Dunn asked to have parking added to the issues list.

Turning to the issue of the review panel representation, Commissioner Querry noted that staff made a minor revision to the wording of the proposal to allow the Mayor to appoint someone where there are no CAC or neighborhood representatives present. It was agreed that in order to assure not slowing down the process, where there is no CAC the Mayor should appoint two members of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Dunn proposed that where the Commission is involved at the higher level of approving a concept, the Commission should not be involved again in the detailed meetings focused on a submittal.

Commissioner Petitpas asked who reviews the submittals in Kirkland. Mr. Soules ((off mike response)) ... made by the Planning Commission, not a panel. It is done in a public format.

A Regional Coalition for Housing Director Arthur Sullivan asked if those who are selected in the first step have their projects reviewed a second time by the same group. Mr. Soules said the process then moves directly to the Type II permit process, which requires City Council approval. The neighborhood meeting occurred between the “beauty contest” and the formal application.

Commissioner Parnell thought it would be good for the Commission to be involved in at least the first set of reviews, whether formally or informally, so that tweaks can be proposed to the process as needed. Chair Snodgrass disagreed. He said he likes the proposal for a panel made up of two members of the Design Review Board, one or two members from the Commission, and someone from the Technical Committee. The Commission simply is not qualified to make decisions of that type.

Commissioner Querry asked for comments regarding process. Chair Snodgrass said he generally agrees with the process as proposed, which he said as he understood it would occur only once annually. Ms. Shirk said there has been some discussion about making the review ongoing to allow for evaluation of exceptional projects that may be submitted. The general intent is to develop a means by which innovative development projects can be reviewed, to allow consideration of housing types that have not previously been considered. Where deemed appropriate, the regulations will be updated to reflect the innovative concepts.

Mr. Sullivan said the original intent of Kirkland was to move forward with a single project. They ended up choosing two projects, but they were both in the same neighborhood, so they concluded that there should be a second round. He suggested that having a single deadline annually could generate interest and a good response.

Chair Snodgrass commented that where all applications are due at a set time, there is ample opportunity to compare the submittals and select the best from among them; that is not the case where applications can be submitted at any time of the year. On the other hand, if after the submittal period closes a property that would be perfect for an innovative design comes on the market, a developer would likely not want to wait for

another year. Ms. Shirk said the ordinance gives the Council the ability to authorize other projects. The ordinance could be adjusted to establish a submittal date quarterly. If the ordinance retained its limit of only five projects per year, those most interested would likely want their projects included in the first round each year.

Chair Snodgrass indicated support for allowing proposals to be submitted at any time of the year. Commissioner Allen favored having two submittal dates annually, the approach used in Kirkland.

Commissioner McCarthy asked how quickly a permit decision could be made after the submittal date. Ms. Shirk said it is theoretically possible that permits could be issued within two months. However, the process as envisioned involves an initial review by the panel, followed by a neighborhood meeting and a second review by the panel, before final authorization to proceed is given. From the deadline date, it would be reasonable to have a recommendation to proceed from the review panel within four or five weeks. It takes about three weeks to schedule a neighborhood meeting, then another couple of weeks for the review panel to meet the second time. Commissioner McCarthy said that means anyone submitting a proposal would not know for three months whether or not their project has been approved or rejected.

Commissioner McCarthy offered his support for having a couple of known submittal dates annually. It would be even better to limit the number of approved projects from any given submittal process to only three; if the panel were to conclude that five projects submitted at once all merit going forward, the city may not be able to deliver.

Mr. Sullivan pointed out that between the time the project submitted by Mr. Soules to Kirkland was approved and the time when the design work was ready for the review under the permitting process was a full year.

Mr. Soules said what the development community needs is a fairly short period of time between submittal and consideration by the panel review. That allows the developer time to revise the project as necessary before meeting with the neighborhood. Once the neighborhood meeting has gone through, it will take two to four months of engineering and design time just to get an application ready for submittal. Following that, an additional four or five months is needed to get the entitlement. From the time of the entitlement to final building permits it can take another four or five months. He suggested that having three or four submittal deadlines per year would be better than having only one or two.

Commissioner Dunn showed her favor for two submittal dates per year, provided the Council is allowed the ability to entertain exceptional projects outside the established submittal dates. She said she really likes the notion of having the neighborhood all come together to review the project and become educated about innovative housing. The competitiveness associated with the process will also spur the development community on to even more creativity. It should be possible to reduce the time between submittal

and authorization to move ahead to more detailed drawings, either by not having the panel meet a second time, or by having the neighborhood meeting up front.

Commissioner Parnell said he would like to see the awarding of project approvals occur in conjunction with a public event such as Derby Days. He agreed with Commissioner Dunn that the process as outlined includes some redundancy that could be eliminated. There should be only one review panel review, but three or four submittal deadlines each year.

Commissioner Query supported the concept of having three submittal deadlines, and having just one review by the panel instead of two.

There was straw vote approval for having two deadlines annually, and for allowing the Council to have authority to approve additional projects throughout the year. There was also agreement that the panel review meetings should be open to the public and broadly noticed.

Commissioner McCarthy said he would like to see the panel meet to discuss the neighborhood meeting input no later than one week following the neighborhood meeting. Ms. Shirk said she could not guarantee a schedule that tight.

Mr. Bateman said he favors shortening the process to the extent possible but urged the Commission to retain the second review by the panel. It always is better to have the full support of the neighborhood than to have a shorter process.

Mr. Soules said under the Kirkland approach the filing deadline is on a Friday. On the following Monday the city sends out notice to the public that applications have been received under the innovative housing code, and the public has three weeks to visit City Hall and review the submittals prior to the neighborhood meeting. It is a very solid public process. One way to shorten the process would be to eliminate the second panel review but to require staff to consult with the panel after the formal application is submitted.

It was agreed that Commissioner Query should work with staff offline to flush out some of the options and ideas that have been brought to the table. The Commissioners were asked to provide staff with their issues rankings as soon as possible.

****BREAK****

STUDY SESSION

Transportation Master Plan

Principle Planner Terry Marpert provided the Commissioners with a schedule showing the various Council, Commission and public meetings for review of the transportation master plan. He noted that both the community open house and public hearing before the

Commission are scheduled for March 9, though not at the same time of day. The ultimate goal is to have a recommendation before the Council by the end of March and a Council decision by the end of May.

Chair Snodgrass said he could see no reason to formally review Chapters 1, 2 and 3 given that they are simply recitations and statements of fact and existing policies.

Commissioner Parnell suggested that each chapter should be subjected to four specific questions: 1) Are the project priorities driven by concurrency rather than development? 2) Does the chapter enforce multimodal buildout? 3) Do the policies take community character into account? and 4) Does the chapter contribute to the observation of real travel demand needs rather than LOS measurements?

Chair Snodgrass reminded the Commissioners that the document was prepared by experts to whom the city paid a lot of money. He suggested focusing on whether the document is consistent with the established vision and goals, and the reasonableness of the implemented provisions. He said he would like to hear from the Commissioners whether or not there needs to be a review of the projects to be built out over the next six years.

Commissioner Querry responded that if the Commission is going to have a discussion concerning concurrency, there will have to be some focus given to the list of projects necessary to attain concurrency.

Chair Snodgrass noted that in Chapter 6 there is a list of 50 or 60 projects set forth that staff has concluded meet the land use projections for 2022. Senior Engineer Kurt Seeman said staff believes the projects support the ideas set out in the plan and are within the estimated budget. Appendix A-1 includes a list of additional projects that are needed to meet the ultimate build out of the city envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Petitpas asked what the Commission can contribute to the process by discussing the projects on the list. Commissioner Querry proposed that if staff were to provide the Commission with a reflection of the reasoning that led to the choosing of the projects on the list, a full discussion of the projects on the list would be obviated.

Chair Snodgrass said that information will be very useful. He allowed that staff and not the Commission has the expertise to determine which projects are most important for maintaining concurrency and addressing the traffic issues through 2022 with the available dollars. If the Commission accepts the reasoning of staff, then the impact fee issue will be closed as well given that the plan is based on the current level of impact fees revenues.

Mr. Seeman suggested that there should be a presentation on the modeling used and how staff reached the conclusions they did with regard to which projects should be on the list. He stressed that the plan as proposed is not aimed at relieving all congestion in the city. Even if all of the projects are constructed, there will be more congestion in the future. The plan is about transportation choices and funding various modes of travel.

Commissioner Dunn said her first concern is to make sure the projects on the list are adequate to meet the concurrency requirements. Beyond that the Commission should debate whether or not the plan should go even further.

Chair Snodgrass agreed. He said he does not yet know what the honest and candid opinion of staff is with regard to the transportation master plan.

Commissioner Dunn stressed the importance of implementing the vision across all of the chapters in the document plan.

Chair Snodgrass said it will be necessary to work through each chapter individually. The only question is whether that should be done first or if the more global issues should be tackled first.

Commissioner Allen said her approach has been to make sure the content of the chapters is consistent with the policies of the Transportation Element. As a group, the Commission should work through the document chapter by chapter first.

There was consensus to review each chapter individually first, develop a list of major themes and then discuss those to make sure the transportation master plan implements the vision of the Transportation Element that has already been adopted. There was also agreement that the Commission should review the projects called out in the plan with an eye on determining whether or not they support the planned land use through 2022.

Commissioner Query stressed the need to avoid getting hung up on funding in the first look at the project list. She asked if they are shown in priority order. Mr. Seeman said they are prioritized for the first three years, and to a lesser degree for the first six years. Beyond that the prioritization is a bit more fuzzy. He said he will prepare materials for a discussion on how the project list was generated by staff.

It was agreed to extend the meeting beyond 10:00 p.m. for a couple of minutes.

REPORTS

Mr. Marpert reminded the Commissioners of the workshop coming up on March 4 and 5.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

ADJOURN

Chair Snodgrass adjourned the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT D

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Yoder [mailto:bob.yoder@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2005 9:15 PM

To: Terry Marpert; Terry Shirk

Subject: PC - Innovative Housing

ATTN: PC

Dear "Terrys" -

I enjoyed watching PC's discussion on Innovative Housing and consider it an invaluable tool to evaluate a variety of higher density options for structure, function, neighborhood fit and style. I recommend we try to reach a larger neighborhood than the standard 500 feet notice. Let's be innovative and notify withing a 1500 foot perimeter. An announcement in the Redmond Reporter and Focus is an excellent idea. I remember seeing the Kirkland Mayor on King County TV during affordable housing discussion state how they use their I.H. ordinance as a way to involve the whole community in evaluating higher density architecture and styles. Please invite the disabled family populations when ADU's are demoed.

On a separate issue, has the city ever experimented with innovative commercial business building designs, especially "village markets". When you drive down 164 th St. the furniture store layout almost gives a feeling of a traditional neighborhood until you see the 7/11 store. If there was some way to encourage design of neighborhood markets to butt up to the sidewalk to hide the parking in a back ally our neighborhoods would feel and function more like a true neighborhood (rather than a series of culdesacs.).

and one parting shot at the Chair! "evil planners getting paid good money to keep us away from pain of project..."

is not conducive language or encouraging of the public's participation in project site review. and it only encourages those "evil planners". . I'll chalk it up to an old school legalize habit of thought :)

Thanks for your hard work on this ordinance. It is awesome!

Regards,
Bob Yoder
Education Hill